

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 07-CR-300

THOMAS W. CREWE,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER ADOPTING RECOMMENDATION OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

---

The Defendant Thomas W. Crewe is charged in a one-count indictment with Possession of Child Pornography contrary to Title 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(5)(B). The Government included in the indictment a forfeiture provision. On January 11, 2008, defendant filed a motion for suppression of evidence and requested an evidentiary hearing (Docket # 11). As is the practice in this district, the motions were referred to the assigned magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). The parties stipulated to the relevant facts and the issue raised by Crewe's motion was fully briefed. In a well-reasoned decision, Magistrate Judge Patricia J. Gorence issued her recommendation on February 4, 2008, that the motion to suppress be denied.

The ten days allowed for the filing of written objections to the proposed findings and recommendation of the magistrate judge have passed and no objections have been filed. If no objection or only a partial objection is made, the district court judge reviews the unobjected-to portions of a magistrate judge's recommendation for clear error. *Johnson v. Zema Sys. Corp.*, 170 F.3d 734, 739 (7th Cir. 1999). The clear error standard means that I can overturn the magistrate

judge's ruling only if I am "left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been made."

*Weeks v. Samsung Heavy Indus. Co.*, 126 F.3d 926, 943 (7th Cir. 1997).

Here, I am satisfied from my review of the magistrate judge's recommendation that she did not commit clear error. I therefore accept the recommendation and adopt the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth therein as my own.

Dated this 21st day of February, 2008.

s/ William C. Griesbach  
William C. Griesbach  
United States District Judge